

REMARKS

In the OFFICE ACTION dated April 16, 2004, claim 26 was objected to due to an informality relating to applicants' inadvertent use of improper english. Applicants amend claim 26 to remove the impropriety as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 29 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants amend claims 29 and 38 to remove the inconsistency that was present when these two claims (which require a combination of trifunctional and difunctional epoxy resins) were dependent on claims 26 and 35, respectively, which were limited to tetrafunctional epoxy. Claims 29 and 38, as amended, are now dependent on claims 1 and 17, respectively, which are not limited to tetrafunctional epoxy resin.

Claims 26, 31 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhou et al '910 and Zhou et al '257 (both parents of the present application) because they both disclose a species (tetraglycidyl-diaminodiphenyl-methane) of the genus (tetrafunctional epoxy) that is claimed in claims 26, 31 and 35. Applicants amend the rejected claims to remove the genus "tetrafunctional epoxy" and include the species "tetraglycidyl-diaminodiphenyl-methane". Support for the amended claims is now provided in the parent cases so that the effective filing date for the subject matter of amended claims 26, 31 and 35 coincides with the parent cases. Accordingly, Zhou et al '910 and Zhou et al '257 are no longer available as references under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) against claims 26, 31 and 35, as now amended.

Claims 27-29, 32-34 and 36-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou et al '910 and Zhou et al '257 in view of a number of secondary references. In accordance with 35 U.S.C. 103(c), applicants do hereby state that the present application (10/001,499) and the references (Zhou et al '910 and Zhou et al '257) were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to HEXCEL Corporation. In view of this evidence, applicants submit that both Zhou et al '910 and Zhou et al '257 should be excluded as prior art pursuant to 35

U.S.C. 103(c). Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection of claims 27-29, 32-34 and 36-38 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants include herewith (by way of a supplemental INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT) the results of a supplementary European search that was conducted by the European Patent Office (EPO) in connection with a related application.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be reconsidered and allowed.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No.50-1811.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2004



David J. Oldenkamp, Reg. 29,421
SHAPIRO & DUPONT LLP
233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700
Santa Monica, California 90401
(310) 319-5411 (Telephone)
(310) 319-5401 (Facsimile)